IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 60 OF 2005
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 1438 OF 2005

Krishna Lokare & Ors. .. Petitioners
Versus
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr. Ramesh Ramamurthy for the Petitioners
Mr. G.D. Utangale i/b Utangale & Co. for the Respondent No. 1 and 2.
Mr. S.K. Sthalekar a/w A.A. Mir for Respondent No.3.

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 61 OF 2005
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 1436 OF 2005

Chanda Avate & Ors .. Petitioners
Versus
Debashish Chakravarty & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr. Ramesh Ramamurthy for the Petitioners
Mr. G.D. Utangale i/b Utangale & Co. for the Respondent No. 1 and 2.
Mr. S.K. Sthalekar a/w A.A. Mir for Respondent No.3.

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 63 OF 2005
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 1437 OF 2005

Uma Sunil Bhaskaran & Anr. .. Petitioners
Versus
Debashish Chakravarty & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr. Ramesh Ramamurthy for the Petitioners
Mr. G.D. Utangale i/b Utangale & Co. for the Respondent No. 1 and 2.
Mr. S.K. Sthalekar a/w A.A. Mir for Respondent No.3.

CORAM : S.K. SHAH, J.
DATED : 2ND SEPTEMBER, 2005

P.C.-

1. These Contempt Petitions are filed alleging that the order dated 6th May, 2005 has not been complied with by the Respondents. The direction given by this Court was that-

"Subject to the certification of the

transit accommodation by the Authority

> as being fit and habitable for accommodation, and the Petitioners shall immediately upon such certification shift to the transit accommodation. In the event that the S.R.A. comes to the conclusion that the transit accommodation is not fit for occupation, the Developer shall take steps to provide alternative accommodation subject to the due satisfaction of the S.R.A. with regard to the safety and fitness of the accommodation."

Thereafter, by an order dated 19th August, 2005, the S.R.A. was directed once again to visit and inspect the site and satisfy himself whether the transit accommodation is fit and habitable for accommodation and submit the report.

2. Now the Sub-Engineer of S.R.A. Mr.D.B. Patil has filed affidavit dated 26th August, 2005, specifically stating therein that the Developer had carried out the necessary structural strengthening works, repairs in and around the said transit camp structures and now the said structure are habitable. The affidavit further mentions that the Sub-Engineer of S.R.A. Mr. D.B. Patil had personally visited the transit camp and got it inspected by the Structural Engineer M/s. Vipinchandra N. Shroff and the certificate issued by said M/s. Vipinchandra Shroff has also been annexed.

3. This was done in pursuance of the compliance of the orders of this Court dated 6th May, 2005 and 19th August, 2005.

4. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner, however, makes a grievance about this affidavit mainly on the ground that S.R.A. had not personally visited the site. However, this submission has no force as the affidavit has been filed by the S.R.A., wherein he has categorically stated that he had personally visited the transit camp, not only that he had obtained the certificate from the registered Structural Engineer M/s. Vipinchandra Shroff, for due compliance of the orders of the Court.

5. In view thereof, the Contempt Petition No. 60 of 2005, Contempt Petition No. 61 of 2005 and Contempt Petition No. 63 of 2005 stand disposed of.

[S.K.SHAH, J.]